

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ROBERT JOSEPH MCCARTY,
Plaintiff,
v.
JOHN V. ROOS, et al.,
Defendants.

2:11-CV-1538 JCM (NJK)

ORDER

Presently before the court is a motion for partial summary judgment filed by *pro se* plaintiff Robert Joseph McCarty. (Doc. # 224). Defendants filed a response in opposition (doc. # 229), and plaintiff filed a reply (doc. # 230).

18 The court finds that the instant motion is an unnecessary and repetitive filing. This motion
19 represents at least the third time *pro se* plaintiff has moved for summary judgment since the filing
20 of his second amended complaint, prior to the commencement of discovery in this case. There is no
21 new information or argumentation relied on by plaintiff in this motion that has not previously been
22 addressed by the court.

The court has broad discretion in managing its docket. *See, e.g., Landis v. N. American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936) (Every court has inherent power to “control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.”). In exercising that discretion, the court is guided by the goals of securing the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of actions. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.* Federal courts have an inherent “traditional power to

1 manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." *In re*
2 *Lavender*, 180 F.3d 1114, 1118 (9th Cir. 1999) (citing *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 43
3 (1991)).

4 In accordance with the principles of judicial economy, the court finds it appropriate to deny
5 plaintiff's motion without prejudice.

6 Accordingly,

7 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that *pro se* plaintiff Robert
8 Joseph McCarty's motion for partial summary judgment (doc. # 224) be, and the same hereby is,
9 DENIED.

10 DATED April 8, 2014.

11 
12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**
13

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28